

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V0530/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	13 March 2013
PARISH	KINGSTON LISLE
WARD MEMBER(S)	Yvonne Constance
APPLICANT	Mr James Lonsdale
SITE	Kingston Lisle Oxfordshire, OX12 9QR
PROPOSAL	Construction of two dwellings and the demolition of one agricultural barn on the land at Marfield, Kingston Lisle
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	432806/188174
OFFICER	Mark Doodes

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application site measures 0.3ha and is at the northern end of Kingston Lisle, which is part of a group of settlements located in the Uffington – Wantage basin. The basin forms part of the Lowland Vale.
- 1.2 The site mainly consists of a paddock area bounded on three sides by a mature and thick hedge line containing a variety of trees and bushes. The boundary to the east is less solid and is demarcated more by a change to arable land. Of note is that an area of agricultural land is included in the application site. A former cattle shed structure exists on the southern end of the site, which is in a poor state of repair.
- 1.3 The site is not within the Kingston Lisle conservation area and contains no listed buildings. A copy of the site location plan is **attached** at **appendix 1**.
- 1.4 The application comes to committee as the parish council supports the proposal and the officer recommendation is to refuse permission.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for two large detached dwellings measuring 241 sq metres and 283 sq metres floor space respectively, excluding any garages or outbuildings. The dwellings are two storeys and are both L-shaped and reflect many of the design elements that are characteristic of the area. The primary consideration relates to the principle of the proposed development on this site. A copy of the detailed plans and elevations is **attached** at **appendix 2**.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council:

“The response is made on behalf of the PC after consideration by three councillors representing a quorate and majority decision. Two councillors were unable to participate in discussions because of an actual or potential conflict of interests. The application to develop two properties, as set out in the relevant application and as described in the documents submitted by the applicant, is supported by the PC. The application was one of three submitted in response to the then Interim Housing Policy and was one of two that met favour with the PC and the majority of

residents who expressed views. The views of both the PC and the majority of residents conjoin on the following issues:

There is a benefit in limited growth for both the village and the wider community in South Oxfordshire.

This can and should only be achieved by sustainable and organic growth.

There is a need for family housing particularly as there are concerns regarding the aging profile of residents.

Development should not be at the expense of green belt or agricultural land

Any development should be in keeping with the general building scheme of a Downland village and, in particular, the conservation area designated in the village proper and not detract from any listed building in any aesthetic manner. No development should be built that does not have adequate parking facilities due to problems with on road/verge parking in the village.

The PC has considered the views of two residents who have already made representations to the District raising concerns which the PC endorses and believes need to be addressed. We note that these residents do not oppose the proposed development per se.

As the PC we wish to add two other general points that need to be addressed by the District being standard representations and concerns raised by the PC for all developments namely there:

should be no drainage or run off for surface water onto the highway due to flooding incidents in the village in the past affecting residents.

must be consultation with Thames Water and confirmation (we note the response provided by Thames Water) that the existing system regarding sewage is adequate to cope with the development.*

*This matter is raised due to continuing problems with the Pumping and Dowsing equipment situated near to St John the Baptist Church which constantly needs attention by the statutory undertaker due to breakdowns and flooding at the site.

It is noted that the application now submitted by the Applicant is not that originally discussed with the PC as it now involves a proposal for two, rather than three, houses. We understand that the number of houses was scaled down at the recommendation of officers of the District. On reflection two houses may be more appropriate and achieve the level of sustainable growth which more readily meets the concerns of both the PC and the majority of residents. The proposed properties, if built in accordance with the submitted plans, look attractive and, it is generally considered, will improve the overall aspect of the village - the barn is not attractive nor the site at this point in time. Improvement of the village sight lines is an important consideration for the PC and residents and a matter the PC has specifically taken into account in its decision.

There is no substantial loss of agricultural land given the size of the location of the proposed development including the demolition of an unsightly barn which is a mitigating factor in terms of our policy of maintaining green belt and agricultural land. Further there is no impact on employment in the area or the equine businesses on which the village depends for local business.

The PC therefore supports the proposed development. It should be noted that whilst this application is supported and will lead to an increase in village population this does not mean that the PC or the village would support further or substantial development in the future.

It is the view of the PC and the majority of villagers that whilst there is an acknowledgement of the benefits of growth, it must be tempered by the needs of the village in terms of sustainable growth to avoid the consequences and problems that would be incurred by a large or unsustainable population

increase.

Likewise, in a village that regrettably has no school or shop amenities, there are concerns regarding large scale developments, even what some may describe as relatively modest developments, due to the impact on other communities and the infrastructure requirements such as roads. It should be noted that any substantial increase on the pressure on our roads would itself cause difficulties as the village proper (including the proposed development site) is not gritted in winter and there are a number of problems concerning vehicles on our roads.”

- 3.2 Thames Water - No objections, subject to standard conditions.
- 3.3 Landscape Architect – Some concerns regarding trees, the scale of the units proposed and boundary treatments.
- 3.4 County Highways - No objections.
- 3.5 Waste Management team – No objections.
- 3.6 Three letters have been received from neighbours, not objecting but raising some concerns on drainage issues, and possible inaccuracies on the submitted plans and the shown boundaries.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 None

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies:

- H12 - Development in the smaller villages
- H13 - Development elsewhere
- DC1 - Design
- DC6 - Landscaping
- DC7 - Waste collection and recycling
- DC9 - Impact of development on neighbouring uses
- NE9 - Lowland Vale

- 5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 5.3 The Residential Design Guide was adopted in December 2009.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The key issues to consider with this application are:
 - 1) the principle of the proposed development in terms of the built-up area of the village
 - 2) the degree of compliance with policy H12 and the NPPF relating to new housing development on the edge of the smaller villages
- 6.2 The location of the two proposed houses is considered to lie outside the built-up area of the village as the site lies well to the north of the main part of the village and it has a road frontage of approx 42m which is well beyond the traditional definition of infilling. This, combined with set back and angled nature of the house to the north effectively, undermines and in-filling case. Based on this assessment, at least in policy terms, the

site lies in open countryside. This assessment is reinforced by the fact that part of the site is presently arable land and the remainder has a paddock appearance and an open aspect to the rear. The site is also not particularly well enclosed. The proposal, therefore, is not a sustainable form of development and, as such, it is not compliant with the NPPF or local plan policies H12 or H13.

- 6.3 Kingston Lisle is identified as a smaller village in both the adopted local plan 2011 and the emerging local plan 2029. This means that the village offers only limited services and facilities. The NPPF explicitly states that only sustainable development should be promoted. Based on the limited facilities in the area and the location of the site outside the built-up area of the village, future occupants of the dwellings would lead a relatively car dependant lifestyle and the proposal is not considered to be a sustainable form of development.
- 6.4 Setting aside the issue of the village boundary, the proposal amounts to a density of only 6.6 dwellings per hectare, which is very low. A typical edge-of-village density would be approximately 20 dwellings per hectare. Therefore, if the site was considered suitable for development in principle, it could reasonably accommodate four units, which in turn would make the properties more accessible to a wider range of occupants. Given the size of the proposed units (the larger, at 283 sq metres, would be one of the largest in the area), the proposal does not help to create a good mix of housing types and tenures which has been proven to contribute strongly to a diverse and cohesive local community. Policy H12 articulates this view in specifying that schemes for new housing within the village will be limited to sites suitable for not more than “four small dwellings”. In this instance both homes proposed are very large, and it is considered that they will not “...widen housing opportunity and choice...” in the area. Therefore, the application is not considered to comply with policy H12 of the local plan or paragraph 50 of the NPPF.
- 6.5 In terms of the extent to which the proposal addresses the five year housing land supply shortfall, the contribution of two units is noted, but is not significant enough to be given substantial weight, particularly given the site’s unsustainable location. Equally, the parish council, in their supporting statement, does not discuss any housing policies in the local plan and instead refer to the defunct Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP), which carries no weight in the consideration of this planning application.
- 6.6 It is accepted that the design of the units proposed, although very large, is of a high quality albeit somewhat bulky due to their footprint. In addition, there are no concerns over impacts on neighbours. The parking, drainage, landscaping, materials and other matters are not considered to raise concerns that could lead to reasons to refuse planning permission.
- 6.7 The site lies within the Lowland vale. The sporadic and ribbon style of the proposed development would constitute an undesirable intensification of the loose-knit development in the area. Therefore, the proposal would harm the attractive rural character of the area and so is not considered to accord with policy NE9 of the local plan.
- 7.0 **CONCLUSION**
- 7.1 In summary, the proposal is not considered to lie within the built-up area of Kingston Lisle and it features two very large dwellings which do not satisfy policy H12 in terms of providing further modest homes in such locations. The proposal is not considered to be a sustainable form of development and so is contrary to the NPPF.

7.2 In addition, the proposal is considered to erode and damage the open rural character of the area and this part of the Lowland Vale. The proposal, therefore, is not considered to comply with the policies of the local plan or the NPPF.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1. Outside of the main village boundary – the proposal site does not form part of the main village proper, and is also not “infill”, with no frontage to extend. Therefore the creep of ribbon development proposed is not considered acceptable in this location. Contrary to local plan policies H12 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 55.**
- 2. Not a mix of accessible homes – The large scale of the homes proposed, will not add to the choice and mix of homes available in the area and no agricultural exception has been proposed. Policy H12 (at Para 8.57) makes allowance for “...small dwellings...not overly large....three bedrooms...”. This is not the case in this application, therefore it is contrary to local plan policies H12 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 50.**
- 3. Not a sustainable location – Kingston Lisle has only a limited range of facilities and services available to prospective occupants, therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to local plan policy H13 (at para 8.58) the NPPF, which supports only *sustainable* development at paragraph 197.**

Author: Mark Doodes
Contact number: 01235 540519
Email: mark.doodes@southandvale.gov.uk